

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/208,998	GANESAN ET AL	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	James W Myhre	3622	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James W Myhre.

(3) Ken Hobday.

(2) Hans Dreyer.

(4) Al Stadnicki.

Date of Interview: 05 May 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 3, and 18.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sandberg-Diment (5,826,245) and Kravitz (6,029,150).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

4.0

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussion was held on what the Examiner was interpreting within Sandberg as the authorization from the customer in Claim 1. Also discussed was a possible feature that could be more clearly defined to show that the authorization also included the price of the purchase. Claim 3 and 18 were discussed in reference to the ability of the consumer to select the payment option which then determines which path out of the consumer's computer the authorization would take. No agreement was reached.